

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report		
Agency: Reclamation		
Page #	Comments	Response
	A key concern of ours is the absence of "storage" from the document. We agree solving conveyance is critical to achieving success, but equally as important is providing the means for additional supplies and management to further meet reliability and ecosystem needs.	Main purpose of the report is to document why it is prudent to re-evaluate the method of conveyance. Storage is well underway and there is really no need to re-start those evaluations. Progress on storage is mentioned in the "Summary of Past Performance" section and ever so briefly in the last section.
	While through Delta conveyance has its limitations, some form of dual conveyance which would include an isolated conveyance option is possible. Alternative 3 of the CALFED ROD suggests that dual Delta conveyance may improve export water quality and achieve fish recovery goals, but this is not the Preferred Program Alternative. If dual conveyance is recommended, there is no discussion whether an amendment to the CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR and ROD is necessary, other than the text box comment on p.2 which states " <i>This report....does not trigger the need for new or revised environmental documentation.</i> " The CALFED ROD did state that dual conveyance was not a Stage 1 action, so what is the impact on existing environmental documentation if dual conveyance is recommended?	The report does not recommend a method of conveyance rather assess the outcome of the Delta Vision and BDCP and implement as appropriate. Dual conveyance is one possible outcome.
	<b>Executive Summary, Water Supply Reliability, p.ii</b> --Surface water storage is not mentioned here or much elsewhere in the body of the Report. Suggest adding the following language as there has been a significant amount of funding and time put into	Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Progress on storage is mentioned in the "Summary of Past Performance" section and ever

	the storage studies, not to mention the importance of this element to the overall Program and the Governor's position on storage: (1) substantial resources have been invested by Federal, State, and Local lead agencies during Stage 1 to initiate and conduct feasibility studies for potential water storage projects in coordination with stakeholders; (2) significant progress has been made during Stage 1 in conducting feasibility studies that recognize the role and /importance of water storage to help meet current and projected demands for water for multiple purposes in the Bay-Delta region, related Central California watersheds, and delivery areas throughout the State; (3) preliminary alternative plans have been developed and evaluated for several potential projects that have positive benefit-to-cost ratios and justification for Federal and State participation at this stage of the planning process; and (4) it is recommended that all remaining feasibility studies be completed as soon as possible, consistent with Public Law 108-361, the CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act, and other pertinent Federal and State laws.	so briefly in the last section. .
	<b><u>Executive Summary, Water Supply Reliability, p.ii</u></b> The second sentence under Ecosystem Restoration states that the continued decline in Delta smelt and other pelagic organisms is evidence that the Delta ecosystem is unhealthy. This is misleading and needs clarification. The Delta appears to be a healthy place for introduced and invasive species that compete for the same biological environment as Delta smelt and other pelagic organisms. What is the goal of CALFED as it relates to Delta smelt and pelagic organisms? Is the goal to manage the Delta so that native, introduced, and invasive species can all survive or is it to ensure the survivability of native species and selected non-native species? There is definitely a dilemma in pursuing the survival of all native, introduced, and invasive species since the amount of biomass is limited.	Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Another reference to an unhealthy ecosystem under the "Summary of Program Performance" section has been changed.
	<b><u>Executive Summary, Stage 2 Direction, p.iii</u></b> --While there is mention of completing selection of Delta conveyance and	Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Actions noted in the "What's Next?"

	<p>conservation actions, there is no mention of completing and/or selection of the storage projects here <b>or</b> on the prior p.ii in the box titled "continuation of CALFED Program in Stage 2 <b>or</b> on p.20-21 under "Actions."</p> <p>The first bullet states that a selection of Delta actions will be made by December 2008, but will there be adequate foundation/supporting data for decisions?</p> <p>There is mention of "developing" Stage 2 Action Plans, then the very next bullet preparing environmental documentation as outlined in the action plans which aren't yet developed, both here and on p.21.</p> <p>Under "Improving" Program Monitoring, Tracking, and Reporting the text should be consistent to "continue to improve on a system" and not "will implement a new system" which is already underway, both here and on p.21.</p>	<p>section is not intended to be a complete list. The section acknowledges that CALFED agencies will continue many of the Stage 1 actions including storage investigations.</p> <p>Delta Vision and BDCP will come to conclusions based on information they have.</p> <p>"What's Next" section has been modified to show that some of the future direction of CALFED will be shaped after the Delta Vision and BDCP are finished. Similarly that appropriate environmental documents will be prepared following those efforts.</p>
	<p><b><u>Some Concerns about the Condition of the Delta Text Box, 1st bullet, p.3</u></b>--Stating that the fragility of Delta levees is due to having water against the levees year around is misleading since river water is against upstream levees 365 days per year on the Sacramento River, American River, and other rivers. These river levees are not as fragile as Delta levees, but Delta levees are built largely from peat soils which have issues of stability, oxidation, and subsidence. Suggest rewriting this bullet with emphasis on the reason(s) why Delta levees are fragile and subject to more frequent failure.</p> <p>Seems the numerous lawsuits by environmental groups involving the Federal and State agencies regarding the Intertie, the Accord, and OCAP should be part of the list.</p>	<p>Box deleted.</p>

	<p><b>1. Introduction, Item #5., p.1</b>--There is a discussion on the decline of certain Delta fish species yet the discussion fails to mention that species may have declined regardless of what CALFED management actions are taken. Perhaps global climate change and invasive species will require native species to mutate in order to survive. Perhaps the death of Delta smelt and other pelagic organisms is inevitable under the current circumstances and regardless of the management actions taken by CALFED.</p> <p>Item #6. Use of the word "new" is a bit over used and neither the BDCP or the DV are what you would consider "new" with conclusions within the same timeframe of this Report.</p>	<p>Discussion was not meant to identify a reason for the decline just that the decline has lead to actions by others including curtailment of pumping and as one of the reasons for this report..</p> <p>Deleted "new"</p>
	<p>1. Introduction and 2. End of Stage 1 Assessment (specifically Assessment of Likely Future Performance, Water Supply Reliability, p.13-15)--Once again there is virtually no discussion of the feasibility studies that are underway for potential water storage projects, while much is said about other CALFED Program objectives/elements. Inclusion of these studies during Stage 1 (e.g., feasibility studies for Shasta, NODOS/Sites, Upper San Joaquin, Los Vaqueros) is pretty important in recognizing that more storage is vital to meet current and future projected demand for environmental, agricultural, and municipal uses in the Delta, Central Valley, and around the State.</p>	<p>Adjustments made to "Summary of Program Performance" section.</p>
	<p>Global Climate Change - Sea Level Rise, p.4--Scientists have studied the Delta concluding that the sea level has risen and fallen many times over geological time. In fact, the change in sea levels helped to form the peat soils from the corresponding flooding and drying out of tule reeds and other grasses. Since sea level changes have occurred over geologic time, it is reasonable to conclude that species have declined and become extinct and new species created due to the theory of evolution and the survivability of species to adapt to changing conditions.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Also, as sea level rose and fell in the past, the location of specific habitat types likely shifted upstream and downstream with those changes. That is less possible today with the levee system cutting off the historical habitat areas.</p>

	<b>3. Stage 2, Duration, 2nd Sentence, p.19</b> --Stating that " <i>Stage 2 is intended to be the period needed to make decisions and implement the next set of changes to the Delta,</i> " is misleading and makes it sound like we implemented all Stage 1 actions and now we are on to a whole new set of actions. While the ROD identified 2000-2007 as Stage 1 implementation, this makes it sound like we're done with Stage 1 actions, when we aren't.	Duration information deleted..
	<b>4. Conclusions, Item 2., p.22</b> --Federal agencies are not yet in agreement that we have "sufficient" information to draw that conclusion.	Conclusions changed to match the "two page" document developed by the federal agencies. Conclusions changed to "Staff" conclusions.
	Specific Editorial Comments-- Any reference to Appendix A ( <i>i.e., p.13, 2nd paragraph under Water Supply Reliability</i> ) should clarify in the text or in a footnote that it is an independent "BDPAC" assessment.  p.i., Item #3 and #3 on p.22--strike "relevant" before state and federal agencies, more offensive than not.  p.ii., WSR--3rd line "then" should be "than", Delta appears less reliable today than....."  p.iii., 4th bullet--the restoration of the San Joaquin River is not a CALFED action, rather a Settlement action outside of CALFED. Settling parties were clear it not be part of CALFED.  p.7 BDPAC Program Performance and Financing Subcommittee not Performance Measures BDPAC subcommittee.	Language was added in the "Summary of Program Performance" that this was a BDPAC subcommittee's report.  Change made.  Change made.  Agree it is not part of CALFED but believe it could help meet CALFED objectives. SJ River was removed from list of examples.  Change made.

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report

**Agency:DOJ**

Page #	Comments	Response
iii/21	Text about "completing" a "selection" of Delta conveyance and conservation actions. Sentence that says "It is expected that a selection of these actions will be made by December 2008." Since it is already August 2007, what is probably intended here is that Delta Vision will have selected a range of conveyance approaches and conservation strategies for further consideration in an EIR/EIS process.	Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Text changes made under "Coordinating with Other Initiatives" section.

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report

**Agency: DWR**

Page #	Comments	Response
.i	<p>"Executive Summary text box"</p> <p>Regarding box text below: the point associated with the comment on levees isn't fully developed. Please see comment on page 10.</p>	Text box modified. Levee sentence removed.
.ii	<p>Bullet 2, page ii, needs to talk about the refocused CALFED program and how it will work.</p> <p>"Stage 2 Direction starts on page IV (iii) with a continuation of Program implementation with some adjustments. Last year, we went through a major refocusing of CALFED. This event should be discussed in this report. Also, as pointed out in the report, the "through delta" conveyance selected in stage one has not worked and needs a total re-evaluation." This change is a significant "adjustment". This is a major revision to the program. Also, the major tenant of CALFED was "all get better together". It is clear the PPIC report concludes and the Delta Vision is moving toward a conclusion that will not support that approach. There will need to be priorities set and some may not get every thing they want. The report should be more direct and honest about this situation"</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Text in the Summary of Stage 1 Program Performance has been modified to include reference to the 10-year action plan.</p> <p>This document does not make a decision about changing conveyance. Merely points out that conveyance should be re-evaluated. The outcomes of Delta Vision and BDCP will help shape future priorities.</p>
.ii	<p><b>"Water Supply Reliability</b> – Groundwater storage, conjunctive use and recycling projects outside of the Delta have improved water supply reliability in the state. Studies have been conducted and, in some cases, environmental documentation developed for projects to improve Delta</p>	Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Information on storage can be found in assessment of program performance and last section "What's Next". It is not the intent of this

	<p>conveyance or increase surface storage via five projects identified in the CALFED ROD. The South Delta Improvements Program EIS/R was finalized in December 2006; a State Feasibility Study Report (FSR) for In-Delta Storage was completed in 2006; and final FSRs and Environmental Documents for the other four surface storage projects will be released beginning in fall of 2008. However, the program has been unable to implement conveyance improvements to improve water supply reliability and water exported from the Delta appears less reliable today than at the time of the ROD. The State exports pumps were temporarily shut down in early June 2007 to help protect the delta smelt. Based primarily on the risks of increased Delta salinity due to levee failures and the continued conflicts between the in-Delta ecosystem and water exports, it is unlikely that the preferred program alternative can meet the CALFED water supply reliability objectives."</p>	<p>report to specifically identify all actions and activities.</p>
.ii	<p>"Sea level rise will cause the Delta to become saltier in the future, potentially to the point where export water is unusable for consumptive uses."</p> <p>This statement is too simplistic. Poor water quality is more of an economic issue related to the cost of treatment rather than the use of the water at all.</p> <p>The discussion in the first full paragraph on page 18 (16?) can be used to develop text to replace this sentence.</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified.</p>
.iii	<p>"Move inside Delta Actions ahead of outside Delta Actions."</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified. The suggested change has been made in "Actions" section.</p>
.iii	<p>"CALFED agencies will continue Program implementation, with</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly</p>



	<p>some adjustments, during Stage 2.”</p> <p>This statement really “downplays” the significance of the shift from the “through-delta” conveyance approach.</p>	<p>modified. Text has been changed in “Actions” section. Report does not advocate a shift from through-Delta rather it endorses the re-evaluation of conveyance.</p>
.iii	<p>“It is expected that a selection of a range of potential Delta actions will be made by December 2008.”</p> <p>This cannot sound like we are deciding on a preferred alternative before the EIS/R is completed</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Clarification provided in “Coordination with other Initiatives”.</p>
.iii	<p><b>“Completion of Surface Storage Investigations – CALFED</b> agencies are scheduled to begin releasing draft Feasibility Study Reports and Draft Environmental Impact Statements/Reports beginning in 2008 for four projects: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation, North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage, Los Vaqueros Expansion Investigation, and Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigations. Final FSR and EIS/Rs are due starting in Fall 2008.”</p> <p>add</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified. Information on storage can be found in “Summary of program performance” and last section “What’s Next”.</p>
.iii	<p>“feasible surface water storage”</p> <p>delete</p>	<p>Executive Summary has been significantly modified. “Actions” section still refers to “feasible surface water storage” since they are actions that should continue. Suggested detail is beyond scope of this report.</p>
2	<p>“bullet 7 - Refer to the refocused CALFED program”</p>	<p>The “Purpose” section has been significantly modified. The refocused CALFED is mentioned in the “Summary of Program performance” section</p>

3	<p>"Recent court actions that could curtail export of Delta water, including about one-quarter of all the drinking water used in California, highlights the continued conflicts between the ecosystem and water supply. <b>In the future, the affects of climate change, actions to protect pelagic organisms, and seismic events could also alter both the water quality and supply reliability of Delta exports"</b></p> <p><b>Add bold</b></p>	Box deleted
4	<p>"Delta exports can also be impacted significantly from climate change. In addition to the potential effects of sea level rise on Delta water supply and quality (discussed above), projected increases in air temperature may lead to changes in the timing, amount and form of precipitation- rain or snow, changes in runoff timing and volume, effects of sea level rise on Delta water quality, and changes in the amount of irrigation water needed due to modified evapotranspiration rates. [Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into the Management of California's Water Resources, July 2006, DWR, page I] The effects of climate change can change reservoir inflows, delivery reliability and annual average carryover storage. [Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into the Management of California's Water Resources, July 2006, DWR, page III]"</p> <p>Add - The first paragraph discusses fishery and flood issues only. This section avoids discussion on supply reliability impacts. This should be added to tell the complete story.</p>	Essence of suggested text has been added.
6	<p>"Population growth within the Delta, in the surrounding area, and in the state will place more demands on the Delta."</p> <p>You should consider listing population growth in the State to support this statement, not just the regional growth projections</p>	Text changed

8	<p>"The following figure shows qualitative performance rating scales for CALFED Stage 1 performance supported by the information in Appendix A."</p> <p>There is more information in the Executive Summary than in the section on Stage 1 Performance. You need to pull something out of appendix A or from the Summary.</p>	Section was expanded. Also, the section relies on Appendix A for additional detail.
9	<p>"For the following reasons, the assessment of likely future performance is focused on the Delta, with emphasis on the role of conveyance in meeting the four program objectives"</p> <p>We should not ignore the tributaries or the other actions that we are spending millions on to implement, like surface storage. As a reminder, this is part of the Governor's Strategic Growth Plan</p>	Information deleted.
10	<p>"The conclusion stated in the text box is very significant. It addresses the point that is tried to be made in the text box on page i. The text box on page i should be modified to clearly make this point."</p>	Sentence on levees has been removed from the Ex. Summary textbox. The focus of the box is on the tie between conveyance and the 4 objectives.
11	<p>"About 115 islands can be expected to flood in the next 100 years due to seismic events. About 209 islands can be expected to flood in the next 100 years due to high flood flows from storms."</p> <p>These are more islands than there are in the delta. This bullet needs to be restated to accurately describe the results.</p>	Text changed.
12	<p>"Likewise, the rates of water export are affected by <b>requirements established to meet the State and federal Endangered Species acts and water right permits</b> to protect the fish (State Water Resource Control Board, 1999)."</p> <p>Add bold- Don't know if this reference can continue to be made with the edits.</p>	Text changed.

12	<p>"Most of the in-Delta ecosystem actions completed during Stage 1 have been studies for improved understanding of the Delta. In general, these studies have not yet been translated into physical improvements that actually benefit the species. <b>Conveyance projects designed to improve protection of fish have also focused on studies, as opposed to physical improvements. The Through-Delta Facility feasibility study and the studies on the re-operation of the Delta Cross-Channel fall into this category. Other</b> in-Delta conveyance improvements envisioned in the ROD were intended"</p> <p>Add bold</p>	Text changed.
13	<p>"When the report refers to the low 20 mm surveys and then mentions export reductions, it leaves the impression that the reduction was caused by exports. That is not correct. The report should emphasize the toxic events observed this year in the North Delta where Delta Smelt spawned, far away from the effects of the export pumps. The report doesn't need to state that toxics caused this but it should at least point this out.</p> <p>Also, in this section it would be good to also state that the summer tow net survey is about what it was last year. Not great but not 1/10 of last year's values as many of us had expected."</p>	<p>Text changed.</p> <p>Referred to the remaining 4 surveys as a group with lower numbers than previous years.</p>
14	<p>"Based primarily on the risks of increased Delta salinity due to levee failures, <b>climate change</b> and the continued conflicts between the in-Delta ecosystem and water exports, CALFED agencies believe that water supply reliability objectives cannot be met as effectively as previously envisioned with the Preferred Program Alternative"</p> <p>Add bold</p>	Text changed.

14	<p>"section bullet on EWA. This description is incorrect. Actually EWA shifts exports from periods when fish are vulnerable to the pumps to times later in the year when fish are not as vulnerable. EWA does not increase export amounts over all."</p>	Bullet removed.
15	<p>"Many of the points on the pelagic plan are incorrect, especially the part on X2 that is not recommend for dry years. This section should either be deleted or significantly improved and, for each of the points, qualify the proposals based on the scientific uncertainty. Some CALFED agencies are in court on this and we cannot have a document out there that does not have all the caveats with it."</p>	Text changed.
15	<p>"second bullet under other recent events. The toxics events this year should be added"</p>	Text changed
19	<p><b>"Upstream Actions</b> – It appears that program implementation of actions outside of the Delta proper <b>should</b> continue regardless of the actions taken in the Delta. Therefore,"</p> <p>Obviously, this is a policy call. But, ignoring the tributaries outside the Delta is like giving a patient a heart transplant but ignoring his clogged arteries. This also better lines up with the Actions at the end of the report.</p>	"Observation" section deleted.
20	<p>"If the changes require major construction, Stage 2 could last <b>well into the future.</b>"</p> <p>General consensus among DWR reviewers is to leave this undefined. Maybe by the time this report is final an end date can be inserted</p>	Text changed.
22	<p><b>"Completion of Surface Storage Investigations</b> – CALFED agencies are scheduled to begin releasing draft Feasibility Study Reports and Draft Environmental Impact Statements/Reports</p>	More specificity than intended for this report but additions are made to the Summary of Past Performance section.

	<p>beginning in 2008 for four projects: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation, North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage, Los Vaqueros Expansion Investigation, and Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigations. Final FSR and EIS/Rs are due starting in Fall 2008"</p> <p>Add - Based on the Governor's SGP, this deserves its own bullet</p>	
24	<p><b>"Although In-Delta progress has been limited, the CALFED Program has experienced significant progress in areas outside the Delta. CALFED implementing agencies should continue to advance work on surface storage FSRs and EIS/Rs and advance Integrated Regional Water Management Programs to advance a diverse set of water management actions throughout California."</b></p> <p>Make changes</p>	<p>More specificity than intended for this report. See response to page #22 above.</p>

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report		
Agency: Healey		
Page #	Comments	Response
	<p>RE: 2 page Stage 1 document - Overall, however, I am dismayed by the negative tone of the document. I don't think it does us any good politically to dwell on failures or to whine about insufficient funds. CALFED has accomplished A LOT. This document should reflect our success. If I were in the finance department reading this I would be saying to myself "cross CALFED off any future funding". Is this really something we want to go forward???</p> <p>I also have just found time to read the longer report and it suffers from the same negativity. Do the authors really feel that bad about their last 7 years? Is it too late to try to turn this into a positive statement of accomplishment?</p>	Text changes made to accentuate the positive as well as Science's role. Unable to make changes to BDPAC subcommittee's report.

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report

Agency: ISB Duncan Patten

Page #	Comments	Response
.i	<p>"1. There is sufficient information, related primarily to levee integrity, ecosystem quality and fishery recovery, and future changes in Delta conditions to raise questions about the utility of the through-Delta conveyance system in meeting Program goals and objectives."</p> <p>Was through delta conveyance initially a driver of Stage 1. don't recall this in ERP program.</p> <p>The EOS1 emphasizes "through Delta Conveyance" (X-Delta) as the driver of Stage 1, and yet the primary issues during Stage 1 were tied closely to the four objectives: Water Supply, Quality, Levees and ERP. In most cases the ERP program seldom if ever considered X-Delta and funding of projects in ERP, the major expenditures of CALFED in early years were not tied to X-Delta.</p> <p>Is it possible that now that the future of the delta has cross delta conveyance as a major political issue, this is now being emphasized in a review of Stage 1 where it was of little concern during Stage 1.</p>	<p>Significant changes made to Executive Summary. Note box in Executive Summary. Emphasis is on conveyance in this report because of conveyance's role in accomplishing all objectives.</p>
.ii	<p><b>"Ecosystem Restoration</b> – The performance of the ecosystem restoration has been mixed, with most investments and progress in areas upstream of the Delta. However, the continuing population declines for delta smelt and other pelagic organisms are evidence that the Delta ecosystem is not healthy. How well the preferred program alternative meets the ecosystem objectives in the future is largely dependent upon future Delta conditions"</p>	<p>Significant changes made to Executive Summary</p>



	Implies that upstream restoration or changes, many potentially a result of water management may not be important.	
.ii	<p>“Extensive levee failures, flooding of islands, rising of sea level, introductions of invasive species and urbanization will all alter the Delta and more than likely result in a different ecosystem than is in place to day. As a result of changed conditions, the current approach to ecosystem restoration in the Delta will need to be completely reassessed”</p> <p>These are general statements while those under supply and quality are specific examples...</p>	Significant changes made to Executive Summary
.iii	<p><b>“Complete Selection of Delta Conveyance and Conservation Actions</b> – CALFED agencies are currently working with Delta Vision and BDCP on alternative conveyance approaches and conservation options for the Delta.”</p> <p>Most options still appear to be conveyance oriented not comprehensive which would include the “variable delta” in a restoration program</p>	Significant changes made to Executive Summary
I	<p>“The preferred program alternative chosen in the ROD employs a through-Delta approach to conveyance.”</p> <p>Why was conveyance ignored in the ERP program other than riverine restoration? I thought milestones were fundamental basis of ROD</p> <p>X-Delta was ignored in favor of river and riparian restoration (the success of these two should be emphasized along with the outcome of some salmon recovery). The play up of X-Delta in the review gives it inordinate weight in the program which was not the case.</p>	Emphasis is on conveyance in this report because of conveyance's role in accomplishing all the CALFED objectives. It also has an influence on the Delta ecosystem.

2	<p>"The purpose of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program was to achieve four interrelated objectives:"</p> <p>It is interesting to note that water conveyance is not mentioned in these objectives but now is considered the main purpose behind Stage 1 or its assessment. But it is mentioned as an issue mentioned in the ROD.</p>	Emphasis is on conveyance in this report because of conveyance's role in accomplishing all objectives.
4	<p><b>"Global Climate Change – Sea Level Rise</b></p> <p>Over the last 100 years, the sea level at California's Golden Gate has been rising by an average rate of about 0.08 inches per year and now sits about 7 inches higher than it did in 1920. Recent scientific evidence (Mount, et. al., 2006)"</p> <p>More appropriate references e.g., IPCC as below</p>	Reference changed
5	<p><b>Subsidence</b></p> <p>"Current Delta agricultural practices require an aerated root zone"</p> <p>All over the Delta or primarily in islands????</p>	Sentence deleted
6	<p>"While all these parts influence the success of the program, the method of Delta conveyance plays a disproportionately large role because of its influence on water flow, water quality, habitat in Delta channels, and water supply."</p> <p>This point needs to be made or emphasized in Exec Summary and/or other places conveyance is mentioned. Perhaps quote conveyance statement from ROD to make point of</p>	See box in Executive Summary.

	its importance.	
8	<p><b>“Assessment of Likely Future Performance</b></p> <p>For the following reasons, the assessment of likely future performance is focused on the Delta, with emphasis on the role of conveyance in meeting the four program objectives”</p> <p>Emphasizing conveyance to meet four objectives seems reversed. The four objectives should be applied to addressing appropriate conveyance</p>	Emphasis is on conveyance in this report because of conveyance’s role in accomplishing all objectives.
9	<p>“A sampling of the findings from the Phase 1 DRMS analysis include [these numbers are currently being revised with further analysis.”</p> <p>These are all hypotheses, not findings. her analysis]:</p> <p>The findings attributed to DRMS are actually hypotheses. In most cases there is little scientific foundation for these statements other than conceptual thoughts. This problem with “findings” may be true elsewhere in this report</p>	Text changed.
11	<p>“Delta conveyance and the ecosystem in the Delta are closely linked”</p> <p>It is interesting that this concept did not play much if any of a role in the ERP program but should now.</p>	Comment Noted
11	<p>“(Resources Agency, 2007”</p> <p>Not in references</p> <p>Use of “Resource Agency” as a reference needs to be assessed. One assumes this is grey literature which has had little if no peer review. The Resource Agency 2007 reference used in text is not in</p>	Reference added. The Delta Smelt Action Plan and the Pelagic Fish Action Plan are readily available to most readers and provide summaries of many of the issues surrounding the POD.

	the Reference list. What is it???	
11	<p>"Due to the high costs of these screens <b>and scientific questions about their efficacy</b>, they have been deferred (South Delta Fish Facilities Forum, 2005) in favor of upstream restoration actions that may be more cost effective and certain..."</p>	Text changed
12	<p>"The decline continued over the next several years. By 2004, the decline was widely recognized as a serious issue and became known as the Pelagic Organism Decline (POD) "</p> <p>POD is an ecosystem problem but is it really a result of ineffective ERP program as implied? I doubt it. Does the findings of POD really belong in an assessment of ERP progress or is it primarily a problem that became more accentuated over time of the ERP? In ERP Assessment the findings of POD should not be part of ERP assessment. POD is considered a result of ineffective ERP program and yet the potential for POD was considered but POD became more magnified over time.</p>	Material in the ERP section is not an assessment of ERP. But an assessment of whether or not the ERP objective can be reached in the future with the current preferred program alternative.
12	<p>"However, it is not known how much the through-Delta conveyance including water export operations contribute to the POD. Delta smelt and the through-Delta conveyance use the same channels for portions of the year. Some scientists believe that changing the export diversion point would remove this overlap in water conveyance and fish habitat and likely improve conditions for delta smelt".</p> <p>These kind of statements really are not part of an assessment but explanation of where Stage 2 might go.</p> <p>Many statements in ERP (and perhaps other program assessments) are not really part of an assessment but rather guides to Stage 2.</p>	Text changed.

12	<p>"How well the ecosystem objective can be met in the future depends on how the future conditions influence decisions on the physical configuration of the Delta. If future conditions in the Delta result in extensive levee failures, it may be impractical to recover all flooded Delta islands and tracts. In this case, the Delta ecosystem would be quite different than under today's configuration. Changes in the quantities and locations for exporting water in response to permanently flooded Delta islands would also change conditions for the ecosystem. In addition, future sea level rise, introductions of non-native species, and urbanization can change the ecosystem. On the whole, the future conditions will likely result in a different Delta ecosystem than is in place today"</p> <p>See comment above</p>	<p>Intent of report is to lead reader to the need to do something different if CALFED objectives are to be met.</p>
13	<p>Why is not EWA or other environmental water highlighted in ERP as a problem and potential. They are mentioned in Water Supply Reliability but should be mentioned wherever appropriate.</p>	<p>EWA doesn't seem relevant to whether or not ERP objectives can be met.</p>
13	<p>"New information has been surfacing on a weekly and sometimes daily basis. This list will be updated as more information becomes available during the summer of 2007."</p> <p>The following are ongoing actions and findings and how they fit with the assessment in Append. A is uncertain.</p>	<p>Text changed. Appendix A contains an overview assessment of the first seven years of implementation. Appendix A was prepared by one of the BDPAC subcommittees and appended to this report to give the reader a general sense of how progress during those years.</p>
13	<p>"It is <i>generally acknowledged</i> that the export of water and diversion pumping that occurs in the Bay-Delta system is one of many <i>factors suspected</i> of causing the POD and the decline in populations of certain endangered species (Resources Agency, 2005). "</p> <p>Aren't these two statements somewhat contradictory?</p>	<p>Text changed</p>

17	<p>"Another risk to the Delta as a drinking water source may be the catastrophic event that fails and floods multiple Delta islands."</p> <p>The connection between levee failure and water quality shows the importance of some more comprehensive text at the beginning of this document illustrating the interrelationships among the four objectives (maybe it is there and I missed it). Should levee failure follow climate change sea level rise in the text?</p> <p>In this section there is a statement showing linkages between levee failure and water quality. It is important to show linkages among all four programs and this should be emphasized up front.</p>	Discussion of interrelationships in "Purpose" section.
17	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>"Observations"</b></p> <p>So many of the observations here and above use Resources agency assessments as the foundation without any evidence that these have been assessed themselves</p>	Section deleted.
18	<p><b>"Program Progress is Mixed and Sometimes Unknown –</b> The CALFED program has made some progress towards meeting its objectives. But, the lack of data and performance measures makes the understanding"</p> <p>This is a statement I assume is based on Appendix A assessments which appear to be quite disjunct from this document.</p>	Section deleted.
19	<p><b>"3. Stage 2"</b></p> <p>As the CALFED program nears the end of Stage 1, it is important that a direction be established for the second stage of the Program. "</p> <p>Here is a place to highlight, or bullet the major issues that have been covered above that will lead to second stage programs.</p>	Section substantially revised.

	<p>Stage 2.</p> <p>As a lead off to Stage 2 discussion there should be a "bulleted" review of major issues or points from Stage 1 assessment.</p> <p>The transition to Stage 2 and how it builds on results of Stage 1 is not well developed</p>	
20	The majority of actions outside of the Delta are expected to continue in Stage 2.	Text changed

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report		
Agency: ISB/Paul Smith		
Page #	Comments	Response
GC	<p>This is in praise of the CalFED accomplishments in the Delta since the 2000 Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (IMOU) but it is framed as criticism of a weak 'End of Stage 1 report'</p> <p>In one cogent paragraph, the EOS1 states that a May 15 meeting summarized the catches of 5 sampling cruises which caught negligible numbers of Delta Smelt in 5 surveys at biweekly intervals, the last of which came in May 12 ! The genuine alarm of extinction of a threatened species accomplished the closure of the pumps for two weeks in late May and early June.</p> <p>This belies the first statement made in the EOS1 document that no progress had been made in the Delta.</p> <p>Before the 2000 IMOU, the data from these 5 surveys would have been delivered by late summer, acted on by December, and at best published in a scientific note two years later.</p> <p>Instead, in this instance, a team of experts compared these with all past results in context, members of the public could sign on a web site and see the results on a map of the Delta, and the interpretation was acted on.</p> <p>Before 2000, transparency in governance was rated high if all the people who participated in a decision were named. Now every station data point and the method of processing is available to other analysts, the media, proponents and opponents alike. This</p>	Changes made to Executive summary to highlight CALFED's approach including Science. Changes made to "Summary of Program Performance" section.



	<p>does not happen without progress and that progress is worthy of note in this document. There is work yet to do, but the progress to date has been so rapid, I am confident this system is on the right track.</p> <p>It is true of the contentious future we face with expanding problems and diminishing natural resources, "we all have opinions but at least we will begin with the same facts" owing to the careful and consistent guidance of the ROD, IMOU, and particularly the Science Program.</p>	
	<p>When I see a short deadline on a report due later in the month, I expect to see a virtually finished product needing only some minor tweaking.</p> <p>The EOS-1 needs major vetting. We should eliminate all reference to insufficient funds, too little time, not enough experienced or trained people, insufficient direction and obscure goals. We all take this as a given in the first cut. When an administrator sees this in a final stage report the only reaction possible is 'now you tell us'.</p> <p>Dwell on the positive - how many proposals were reviewed by experts? How many agencies continued their cooperation for the whole time? In all the ramping up of the PODS, how many new personnel were trained. Several publications I am aware of have cut new ground in the hydrography of the Delta, the behavior and habitat of a half dozen species --- We are into the nVolume of readily accessible analyses. After some false starts, the Bay Delta and Tributary data base is geared for public access. We have ever so many evaluations of work, fully documented. Most decisions have been based on fully transparent policy, discussion, and data. History of data sources and sampling procedures is available.</p> <p>All of this was done in a cooperative and collaborative environment even as the agencies pursued their mandates. The major agency players are acquainted with each other due to</p>	<p>Changes made to Executive summary to highlight CALFED's approach including Science. Changes made to "Summary of Program Performance" section.</p>

	<p>nNumbers of colloquia, review session, tactical decision meetings, science meetings, and consultations with world class professionals.</p> <p>These professionals have not been merely represented by their books but include one on one workshops with the responsible scientists. In a very complicated physical biological and climatic environment the stage has been set for dynamic models. World class Universities like Davis, Berkeley, Stanford, San Diego have all contributed major efforts.</p>	
--	---	--

Agency Comments- Stage 1 Report

**Agency: SWRCB/CVRWQCB**

Page #	Comments	Response
3/14	Table titled 'Some Concerns about the Condition of the Delta' This table should include an entry regarding the Cease and Desist Order issued by the State Water Board against DWR and USBR regarding threatened violations of the Southern Delta Salinity objectives. This Order is identified as State Water Board Order WR 2006-0006. This Order should also be described in the 'Other recent events threaten water supply reliability' section on Page 14.	Table deleted
12	Ecosystem Restoration The idea of a delta smelt refuge population should be added to the discussion of solutions to recover delta smelt. A refuge population would ensure the continued survival of the species in the event that other actions taken to immediately protect the species are unsuccessful. This action is identified in the Pelagic Fish Action Plan (Resources Agency, March 2007).	Discussion not intended to be about solutions rather information that support a conclusion that the ERP should be reassessed.
15-17	General Comments on Water Quality Section The CALFED Water Quality objective is to provide 'good water quality for all beneficial uses'. The Water Quality section in the report focuses entirely on drinking water quality. The 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (SWRCB, Dec. 2006) identified 17 beneficial uses of water within the Delta, only one of which is Municipal and Domestic Supply. Other significant beneficial uses of water include agricultural uses, and numerous uses associated with fish and wildlife enhancement. While the fish and wildlife	See revisions to assessment of first 7 years. Text of BDPAC subcommittee's report (Appendix A) cannot be changed.

	beneficial uses are addressed in the ecosystem restoration section, agricultural beneficial uses are not addressed in this section. In 2006, the State Water Board issued a Cease and Desist Order against DWR and USBR regarding threatened violations of the Southern Delta Salinity Objectives. This Order is identified as State Water Board Order WR 2006-0006. Additionally, objectives for the protection of agricultural beneficial uses within the southern Delta have been exceeded during July of this year. This information should be included in the assessment of the progress of the Water Quality Program.	
15-17	The Water Boards have developed or are developing total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for dissolved oxygen (DO), salinity, and mercury that in some way either impact, or are impacted by conditions or management actions taken in the Delta. There are also efforts we are undertaking to address unknown toxicity in the Delta and its tributaries. The Water Boards have concerns about how the water quality issues for these non-drinking water related beneficial uses have been addressed in Stage 1.	<p>Intent was not to discuss all actions and activities. A few topics were selected to give the reader a general sense of progress or reach conclusions that it may be prudent to reassess some water quality actions called for in the ROD.</p> <p>Good topic for discussion at ACT.</p>
15-17	The Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) was the CALFED program element where these issues were addressed and the CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) had numerous associated ERP commitments. The problem throughout Stage 1 was that none of the implementing agencies for ERP had responsibility for addressing these issues, and these issues did not have a clear and logical place in a program that was focused primarily on aquatic and terrestrial habitat restoration. As a result these issues either did not get addressed, or the CVRWQCB and SWRCB had difficulty getting them recognized and studies funded by ERP. Although some useful studies have been funded to better understand the DO and mercury issues, more is needed before implementation of solutions can begin.	<p>Intent was not to discuss all actions and activities. A few topics were selected to give the reader a general sense of progress or reach conclusions that it may be prudent to reassess some water quality actions called for in the ROD.</p> <p>Good topic for discussion at ACT.</p>
15-17	* Like the confusion experienced during Stage 1, discussion of the limited progress made on DO (pg. 16), and the concerns related to	Intent was not to discuss all actions and activities.

	mercury (pg. 17) were included in the Water Quality section of the subject report, not in the ERP section where they were actually addressed during Stage 1. There is no discussion in the report regarding the limited progress made on drainage issues in the San Joaquin River (salinity), or unknown toxicity.	A few topics were selected to give the reader a general sense of progress or reach conclusions that it may be prudent to reassess some water quality actions called for in the ROD.
15-17	* It should be clarified that the DO TMDL adopted by the CVRWQCB was a phased TMDL and the related ERP ROD commitment is not satisfied until the final TMDL is adopted (scheduled for 2009). Studies required in the first phase of this TMDL are still not funded by ERP, and no upcoming proposal solicitations or other ERP efforts are pending. Adoption of the final TMDL could be delayed if the remaining studies are not started soon.	Intent was not to discuss all actions and activities. A few topics were selected to give the reader a general sense of progress or reach conclusions that it may be prudent to reassess some water quality actions called for in the ROD.
15-17	* We disagree with the assessment in Appendix A that "significant progress" has been made with San Joaquin River (SJR) drainage problems. Although a salt TMDL was completed, little progress has been made in implementing drainage controls. * Furthermore, while some stakeholder efforts are moving forward with planning of drainage controls, it is not clear that CALFED has been a forum, or provided any significant funding for these stakeholder planning efforts.	Text of BDPAC subcommittee's report (Appendix A) cannot be changed.
15-17	* A major contributor to the buildup of salinity in the SJR watershed has been the recirculation of salt loads back into the watershed caused when large portions of the river get diverted to the CVP pumps, and pumped back to the watershed through the Delta Mendota Canal for irrigation. There has been little or no discussion in the various CALFED forums of this important impact associated with water project operations.	Good topic for discussion at ACT.
15-17	The Water Boards recommend that water quality commitments described in the ROD be included in the Stage 2 actions including implementation of the TMDLs described above and studies to understand unknown toxicity. In addition, it is essential to ensure	The intent was not to be specific at this juncture. Good topic for discussion at ACT.

	<p>that ecosystem water quality be explicitly included in CALFED's structure. The Water Boards already are implementing agencies of the Water Quality Program, which until recently focused solely on drinking water quality. CALFED should make it clear that the Water Quality Program encompasses both drinking and ecosystem water quality and assign members to the BDPAC Water Quality Subcommittee to represent ecosystem water quality issues. Recognizing that ecosystem water quality also must link to and coordinate closely with the Ecosystem Restoration Program, the relationship between the Water Quality Program and ERP must also be made clear and efforts to maintain those links should be made a priority.</p>	
20	<p>Section titled 'Other Initiatives'</p> <p>This section should include mention of the series of workshops being conducted by the State Water Board regarding the four Emerging Issues identified by the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the Delta. These issues are Southern Delta Salinity, the Pelagic Organism Decline, San Joaquin River Flows, and Climate Change. As a result of these workshops, actions may be taken by the State Water Board that could result in changes to water operations.</p>	Workshops added.
25	<p>References</p> <p>Include the SWRCBs Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Dec. 2006)</p> <p>Include the SWRCBs Cease and Desist Order, Order WR 2006-0006</p>	References added.